

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT**  
**SKB LANSING LANDFILL**

Date: 3-24-25 Inspector: David Way  
 Time: 8:27 Weather Conditions: Sunny 44

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84)</b>				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		✓	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		✓	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		✓	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		✓	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		✓	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKR LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 3-17-24 Inspector: [Signature]

Time: 2:42 Weather Conditions: Sunny Mostly

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		✓	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		✓	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		✓	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		✓	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		✓	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKE LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 3-10-25 Inspector: [Signature]

Time: 9:48 Weather Conditions: Sunny

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		✓	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		✓	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		✓	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		✓	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		✓	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKS LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 03-03-25 Inspector: [Signature]

Time: 2:15 Weather Conditions: COLD overcast

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		✓	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		✓	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		✓	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		✓	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		✓	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT**  
**SKE LANSING LANDFILL**

Date: 2-25-25 Inspector: [Signature]

Time: 12:45 Weather Conditions: Cloudy + cold

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		✓	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		✓	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		✓	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		✓	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		✓	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes:

---



---

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKS LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 2-18-25 Inspector: CPW

Time: 8:45 Weather Conditions: windy

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		✓	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		✓	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		✓	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		✓	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		✓	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes: